arXiv:hep-ph/9402300v1 16 Feb 1994

NUB-3083/93-Th
January 1994
hepph/9402300

The Mass of the Dilaton

Haim Goldberg

Department of Physics
Northeastern University
Boston, MA 02115

Abstract

It is shown that, in a theory where the dilaton is coupled to a Yang-Mills gauge field which enters a confining phase at scale Λ, the dilaton may grow a mass $m_{dilaton} \sim \Lambda^2/m_{Pl} \sim (m_{SUSY}^2 m_{Pl})^{1/3} \sim 10^8$ GeV. This allows ample time for decay before the electroweak era if $m_{SUSY} \simeq 1$ TeV, and circumvents cosmological problems normally associated with its existence.

Introduction

The dilaton is a spin-0 field which is associated with the graviton and with an axion as a massless excitation in string theory [1]. In the field theoretic limit it persists as a massless spin-0 field in the no-scale supergravity theory. A truly massles dilaton is of course incompatible with the success of Newtonian gravity, since it couples as a full strength Brans-Dicke field. However, even if a dynamical mechanism were to be found to stabilize the dilaton potential [2], perhaps generating a dilaton mass of the order of the the SUSY-breaking $m_{SUSY} \sim 1$ TeV, severe cosmological problems would still persist. Most notably, the late decay time would cause a substantial reheating well after the nucleosynthesis era [3], vitiating a major success of the standard cosmological model. All of this could conceivably be modified if the dilaton were coupled to a field whose interactions are strong: assuming that the dilaton masslessness is not protected by a strict gauge principle, then mass growth could occur as a result of mixing with composite spin-0 objects in the strongly-interacting sector. This is the mechanism I will consider in this work.

Effective Potential

I begin by presenting the minimal components of the model necessary for this work. I assume that the dilaton field S is universally coupled to all (hidden and unhidden) gauge fields $F^i_{\mu\nu}$, giving a contribution to the Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}_{SF} = S \sum_i F^i_{\mu\nu} F_i^{\mu\nu} \quad . \tag{1}$$

The dilaton field is assumed to develop a vev $\langle S \rangle = 1/g^2$, leaving an interaction with the remaining (quantum) field

$$\mathcal{L}_{\sigma F} = \frac{1}{m_{Pl}} \sigma \sum_i F^i_{\mu\nu} F_i^{\mu\nu} \quad , \tag{2}$$

where $\sigma = S - \langle S \rangle$, and the gauge fields in Eq. (2) are now normalized with canonical kinetic energy. I now assume that at some scale Λ the gauge coupling becomes strong. What I have mostly in mind, of course, is the hidden-gaugino condensate mechanism for generating SUSY-breaking [4]. In such models, one commonly obtains

$$m_{gravitino} \approx m_{SUSY} \approx \frac{\Lambda^3}{m_{Pl}^2} \quad , \tag{3}$$

so that $\Lambda \sim 10^{14}$GeV. In any case, the spectrum at scales below Λ will now contain glueballs, at least one of which will have spin-0, and which will be denoted by G. As a result of (2), there will be σ–G mixing, which can be parametrized by a mixing term

$$V_{mix} = -\mu\sigma G \quad . \tag{4}$$

The coupling (2) and dimensional considerations imply

$$\mu = \kappa \frac{\Lambda^3}{m_{Pl}} \quad , \tag{5}$$

with $\kappa \sim O(1)$. To complete the effective potential for the σ–G system, I introduce glueball and dilaton mass terms, and some quartic terms to stabilize the potential:

$$V(\sigma, G) = \tfrac{1}{2} m_\sigma^2 \sigma^2 + \tfrac{1}{2} m_G^2 G^2 - \mu\ \sigma G + \tfrac{1}{4}\lambda_\sigma \sigma^4 + \tfrac{1}{4}\lambda_G G^4 \quad . \tag{6}$$

In Eq. (6), $m_\sigma^2, \lambda_\sigma$ and λ_G are unknown. For the glueball mass, along with the estimates (3) and (5), we expect

$$m_G = \alpha\Lambda \quad , \tag{7}$$

with $\alpha \sim O(1)$. Although the parameters $m_\sigma^2, \lambda_\sigma, \lambda_G$ have been introduced in complete ignorance of their origin and magnitude, it will turn out, very remarkably, that (a) only λ_σ will be required to be non-zero and (b) as long as $\lambda_\sigma > O((\Lambda/m_{Pl})^4)$, *the mass eigenvalues will be determined entirely by m_G and μ, and will not depend on λ_σ to leading order in Λ/m_{Pl}.*

Mass Spectrum: Simplified Case

I first note that, in the absence of the mixing term, the potential has a minimum at $\sigma = G = 0$. The mixing term shifts this minimum, as well as the mass eigenvalues. We can obtain a general idea of the result of this by considering a simplified situation, in which $\lambda_G = m_\sigma^2 = 0$. The potential then becomes

$$V^{(0)}\ (\sigma, G) = \tfrac{1}{2} m_G^2 G^2 - \mu\sigma G + \tfrac{1}{4}\lambda_\sigma \sigma^4 \quad . \tag{8}$$

The stationary conditions are

$$\begin{aligned} \mu G - \lambda_\sigma \sigma^3 &= 0 \\ m_G^2 G - \mu\sigma &= 0 \quad . \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

These are consistent with either $\sigma = G = 0$, or with

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\sigma} &= \pm \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_\sigma}} \left| \frac{\mu}{m_G} \right| \\ \bar{G} &= \pm \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_\sigma}} \frac{\mu}{m_G^2} \left| \frac{\mu}{m_G} \right| \quad . \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

It is simple to check that the zero-field point (0,0) is a saddle point of $V^{(0)}$, whereas $(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{G})$ lies below that for the zero field values. Thus $(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{G})$ is a true minimum, with energy

$$V^{(0)}\ (\bar{\sigma}, \bar{G}) = -\frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{1}{\lambda_\sigma} \right) \left(\frac{\mu}{m_G} \right)^4 \quad . \tag{11}$$

It is important to note that as long as $\lambda_\sigma \gg (\Lambda/m_{Pl})^4$, the shift in S due to the new vacuum is $\delta S = \bar{\sigma}/m_{Pl} \ll 1/g^2$.

One may wish to constrain the parameters so that the shift in vacuum value of energy be $\lesssim O(|F|^2,)$ where the F is a SUSY-breaking F-term, of $O(m_{Pl} m_{SUSY})$. From (3), this is equivalent to requiring

$$\left| V^{(0)}\ (\bar{\sigma}, \bar{G}) - V^{(0)}(0,0) \right| \lesssim \frac{\Lambda^6}{m_{Pl}^2} \quad . \tag{12}$$

Eq. (12), combined with (5), (7), and (11), implies [5]

$$\lambda_\sigma \gtrsim O((\Lambda/m_{Pl})^2) \quad . \tag{13}$$

Using (10) and (8) one may calculate the quadratic fluctuation matrix (*i.e,* the σ–G $(mass)^2$ matrix $\mathcal{M}^2$) about $(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{G})$:

$$\left(\mathcal{M}^2 \right)_{\bar{\sigma}\bar{G}} = \begin{pmatrix} 3(\mu^2/m_G^2) & -\mu \\ -\mu & m_G^2 \end{pmatrix} \tag{14}$$

There is a remarkable aspect about this result: although a non-zero value of λ_σ was required in order to establish the non-trivial vacuum, *the fluctuations about this vacuum do not depend on the value of* λ_σ. This parameter has acted as a regulator, disappearing in the physical masses (although not in the vacuum energy). The eigenvalues may be immediately calculated, and are most transparent in leading order in $(|\mu|/m_G^2) \sim \Lambda/m_{Pl}$:

$$\begin{aligned} m_{\sigma'} &\simeq \sqrt{2}\ \frac{|\mu|}{m_G} = \sqrt{\frac{2\kappa}{\alpha}} \frac{\Lambda^2}{m_{Pl}} \\ m_{G'} &\simeq m_G = \alpha \Lambda \quad . \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Mass Spectrum: General Case

The treatment of the more general case is slightly more complicated, but the result is the same. In what follows, it will be convenient to set $m_{Pl} = 1$ until the end, and to define

$$\epsilon \equiv \frac{\Lambda}{m_{Pl}} \quad , \tag{16}$$

In accordance with Eqs. (5) and (7),

$$\mu \sim \epsilon^3, \quad m_G^2 \sim \epsilon^2 \quad . \tag{17}$$

Typically, models of dilaton potentials prior to mixing with glueball give

$$m_\sigma^2 \sim m_{SUSY}^2 \sim \epsilon^6 \quad . \tag{18}$$

Beginning with the potential (6), it is apparent that a tachyonic instability develops in the quadratic sector if

$$m_\sigma^2 \; m_G^2 < \mu^2 \quad , \tag{19}$$

which will certainly be the case with the estimates in Eqs. (17) and (18). In such a case, we search for the displaced vacuum and spectrum for (6). The extremum conditions following from (6) are

$$\begin{aligned} m_\sigma^2 \sigma - \mu G + \lambda_\sigma \sigma^3 &= 0 \\ m_G^2 G - \mu \sigma + \lambda_G G^3 &= 0 \quad . \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

These allow the solution $\sigma = G = 0$, with $V = 0$; this is a saddle point if (19) is true. Alternately, there is a non-trivial solution which follows from (20). On eliminating G via

$$G = \frac{\sigma}{\mu} \; (m_\sigma^2 + \lambda_\sigma \sigma^2) \equiv \frac{\sigma}{\mu} \cdot \frac{\mu^2}{m_G^2} \; x \quad , \tag{21}$$

in terms of a dimensionless variable x, one obtains from Eq. (20) the quartic equation

$$f(x) = \left(\frac{\mu}{m_G^2} \right)^4 \left(\frac{\lambda_G}{\lambda_\sigma} \right) \left(x^4 - \left(\frac{m_\sigma^2 m_G^2}{\mu^2} \right) x^3 \right) + x - 1 = 0 \quad . \tag{22}$$

The analysis of the solution spectrum of (22) goes as follows: We first note that, in terms of the small quantity ϵ (Eq. (16)),

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{\mu}{m_G^2}\right)^4 &\sim \epsilon^4 \\ \frac{m_\sigma^2 m_G^2}{\mu^2} &\sim \epsilon^2 \quad . \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

It is then easy to show that (i) $f(0) < 0,\ f(x \geq 1) > 0$; (ii) if $\lambda_\sigma > O(\epsilon^{10})$, then $f(x)$ is a monotonically increasing function for $x \geq 0$. In that case, there is one and only one root for positive x, and we can obtain it by expanding around $x = 1$. After some algebra, one finds that the stationary point occurs at

$$\bar{x} \simeq 1 + O(\epsilon^4) \quad . \tag{24}$$

After this, the analysis proceeds exactly as in the simplified case. Once more, the stationary point $(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{G})$ in field space is given by Eq. (10) up to small corrections, and the energy density at the true vacuum $(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{G})$ is given (up to corrections of $O(\epsilon^4)$) by (11). Thus, in the general case, the energy density at $(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{G})$ is lower than at $\sigma = G = 0$. The masses (to leading order in ϵ) are as before:

$$\begin{aligned} m_{\sigma'} &\simeq \sqrt{2}\,\frac{|\mu|}{m_G} = \sqrt{\frac{2\kappa}{\alpha}}\frac{\Lambda^2}{m_{Pl}} \\ m_{G'} &\simeq m_G = \alpha\Lambda \quad . \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

The result of all this is a dilaton mass

$$m_{dilaton} = m_{\sigma'} \sim (m_{SUSY}^2 m_{Pl})^{\frac{1}{3}} \simeq 10^8 \text{GeV} \quad . \tag{25}$$

The Decay of the Dilaton

From the mass matrix (14) and the eigenvalues (15), it is seen that the dilaton eigenstate σ' differs from the uncoupled σ by terms of $O(\epsilon)$:

$$\sigma' \simeq \sigma + (\mu/m_G^2)G \quad , \tag{26}$$

so that the coupling of the dilaton to standard model gauge fields can be obtained from (2). This immediately yields a lifetime

$$\tau_{dilaton} \approx \frac{m_{Pl}^2}{m_{\sigma'}^3} \approx \frac{m_{Pl}^5}{\Lambda^6} \approx \frac{m_{Pl}}{m_{SUSY}^2} \quad , \tag{27}$$

so that the decay of the dilaton precedes (or is coincident with) the electroweak era [6] .Thus, even if a large amount of energy resides in the oscillations of the dilaton field about its minimum, the reheating caused by its decay would not endanger nucleosynthesis [3] or even anomalous baryosynthesis [7],[8].

Conclusions

It has been shown that the mixing of a dilaton with a heavy scalar glueball, as-determined by the canonical coupling of the dilaton, will result in a dilatonof mass $\sim \Lambda^2/m_{Pl}$, where Λ is the confinement scale of the gauge theory. The result is due to a specific interplay of the mass of the glueball and the size of the coupling. A quartic stabilization of the dilaton potential is necessary for the dynamics, but the magnitude of the coupling plays no role (to leading order in Λ/m_{Pl}) in determining the mass or the coupling of the physical dilaton. Finally, the large mass of the dilaton is shown to circumvent the usual cosmological problems associated with its existence.

Acknowledgment

I would like to thank Tom Taylor for many helpful conversations concerning recent work on string-based SUSY-breaking mechanism. A discussion with Mike Vaughn concerning the analysis of Eq. (22) is appreciated. This research was supported in part by the National Science Foundation (Grant No. PHY-9306524), and by the Texas National Research Laboratory Commission (Award No. RGFY93-277).

References

[1] Aspects of the dilaton are reviewed in M. B. Green, J. H. Schwartz, and E. Witten, *Superstring Theory,* Cambridge University Press, 1987.

[2] M. Dine and N. Seiberg, *Phys. Lett.* **162B**, 299 (1985); for recent efforts in the context of the gaugino-dilaton-moduli framework of supersymmetry-breaking, see S. Ferrara, N. Magnoli, T. R. Taylor, and G. Veneziano, *Phys. Lett.* **245B**, 243 (1990);
A. Font, L. Ibàñez, D. Lust, and F. Quevedo, *Phys. Lett.* **245B**, 401 (1990);
H. P. Nilles and M. Olechowski, *Phys. Lett.* **248B**, 268 (1990);
P. Binetruy and M. K. Gaillard, *Phys. Lett.* **253B**, 119 (1991);
A. de la Macorra and G. G. Ross, *Nucl. Phys.* **B404**, 321 (1993);
B. de Carlos, J. A. Casas, and C. Muñoz, *Nucl. Phys.* **B399**, 623 (1993). Recent discussions of the cosmological problems associated with the dilaton potential are given by
R. Brustein and P. J. Steinhardt, *Phys. Lett.* **302B**, 196 (1993);
B. de Carlos, J. A. Casas, F. Quevedo, and E. Roulet, *Phys. Lett.* **318B**, 447 (1993).

[3] G. D. Coughlan, W. Fischler, E. W.Kolb, S. Raby, and G. G. Ross, *Phys. Lett.* **131B**, 59, (1983);
G. German and G. G. Ross, *ibid* **172**, 305 (1986);
J. Ellis, D. V. Nanopoulos, and M. Quiros, *ibid* **174**, 176 (1986);
O. Bertolami, *ibid* **209**, 277 (1988). See also T. Banks, D. B. Kaplan, and A. E. Nelson, hep-ph/9308292, and B. de Carlos *et al,* [2], for recent discussion.

[4] S. Ferrara, L. Girardello, and H. P. Nilles, *Phys. Lett.* **125B**, 457 (1983);
J. - P. Derendinger, L. E. Ibàñez, and H. P. Nilles, *ibid* **155**, 65 (1985);
M. Dine, R. Rohm, N. Seiberg, and E. Witten, *ibid* **156**, 55 (1985);
C. Kounnas and M. Porrati, *ibid* **191**, 91 (1987). For more recent discussion, see works in Ref. [2].

[5] The value of λ_σ is highly model dependent. In general, multiple gaugino condensates are required in order to yield a positive λ_σ near the local minimum of

the dilaton potential. This can be seen, *e.g.,* by examining some of the models presented in the paper of B. de Carlos *et al,* Ref.[2].

[6] The lifetime of the glueball is shorter by a factor Λ/m_{Pl}.

[7] V. Kuzmin, V. Rubakov, and M. Shaposhnikov, *Phys. Lett.* **155B**, 36 (1985); P. Arnold and McLerran, *Phys. Rev.* **D36**, 581 (1987).

[8] A detailed discussion of the condensate field as inflaton, and of the reheating effects of dilaton decay, have been given by the author in another publication (H. Goldberg, Northeastern University preprint NUB-3082/93-Th, hep-ph/9312282)